THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV JULY, 1951 No. 373

Editorial

THE most difficult period of history to become well informed about is that which immediately precedes one's coming to years of discretion. History books have not yet caught up with it. Prudent historians know that it is still too close to be seen in perspective. Guides, philosophers, and friends, are generally too much engaged by their special interests or allegiances to be able to achieve that kind of detachment and objectivity that is needed for this kind of instruction. Yet only as the immediately preceding period of history is gradually learned about and understood will many things in the present—and many still surviving personalities and groups—become intelligible. If this is true at all, it is especially true of an age in which rapid and far-reaching changes have been taking place. Anyhow, it applies to the history of theology during the past fifty years or so, as all who have recently become theological students are likely to discover.

A welcome therefore should await two recently published books which throw a good deal of light on the course of theological development since about 1890. One of these is the late Dr J. K. Mozley's posthumous work, *Some Tendencies in British Theology from the publication of* Lux Mundi *to the Present Day* (S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d). The "present day" in the title signifies the beginning of the second World War, for Dr Mozley's survey breaks off then. Anyone who has come to years of theological discretion since that time will find that this book succeeds in putting him wise about what had been going on during the half-century before, and seizes upon what was significant in the thought of each of its most influential theologians. Dr Mozley is remarkably fair to all schools of thought, and not least to those theologians with whom he himself was far from agreeing. He achieved a degree of detachment which is very rare in one who had himself been much involved in the conflicting tendencies which he describes. We are referring here to the bulk of the book, which deals with English theology; whether the concluding chapter, which deals with Scottish theology during the same period, is equally successful, we do not profess to be able to judge. The book will certainly be useful to foreign theologians who have much difficulty in understanding, even when they are willing to give serious attention to, the peculiar characteristics of British theology.

The other book, which covers roughly the same period, is *The Life of Baron von Hügel*, by Michael de la Bedoyère (Dent, 25s.). No single theologian at home or abroad stood out in the period which Dr Mozley reviewed as, for example, Karl Barth stands out at

present. But if a single representative of the period had to be selected, Baron Friedrich von Hügel would be as strong a candidate as any. No one exposed himself more resolutely to the intellectual problems that were pressing then upon all open Christian minds, or grappled with them more persistently and at a deeper level. No one had a wider range of friends and acquaintances among theologians of various nationalities and confessions. Did anyone wield more influence in his own quiet and curious way? It was not that the baron was a highly original thinker, but he had a rare aptitude for introducing theologians to one another and for establishing fruitful communications with and between very different types of mind. He exercised the same kind of lay ministry among intellectuals that Dr J. H. Oldham has exercised in our own time.

Moreover, von Hügel was himself a great theological *character*, an unforgettable personality with endearing eccentricities, about whom good stories abound. His spirit impressed those who got to know him even more than his intellect. He was what would now be called both an "ecumenical" theologian and an "existential" thinker. Anyone who wanted to know what those two epithets signify could not do better than to look at them illustrated in this life. The story of von Hügel's life, while it takes its readers right into the theological interests and excitements and conflicts of the first quarter of this century, also confronts them with a great man whose conception of what it means to be a theologian was extraordinarily rich and exacting and has set a permanent standard for future generations. He embodied the "liberal" virtues in the highest sense of the word. All this comes out very clearly in the new biography, which is the best as well as the fullest account that has yet been given of von Hügel's life.

Count Michael de la Bedoyère is an honest as well as a skilful biographer. He has seen that it is impossible to tell the story of the baron's life without giving a candid account of the part he played in the modernist movement in the Roman Church. The facts, even the most awkward ones from a Roman Catholic point of view, are fairly recorded. But the biographer is evidently embarrassed about their interpretation. We read that von Hügel "was a Modernist without any question" (p. 294), and that he "came nearest to being a leader through his indefatigable work as a liaison officer" (p. 193). But we read also that "von Hügel was never a Modernist in the heretical and condemned sense" (p. 228) and that he "really stood in an entirely different position from . . . the real Modernists" (p. 145). The latter statements are, to say the least, exaggerated, and they can only be made at all because de la Bedoyère adopts the view that what made a *real* modernist was "immanentism"—a view to which admittedly von Hügel himself gave some sanction towards the end of his life. Readers can, however, judge for themselves from the evidence supplied in this book whether "immanentism" or freedom of scientific inquiry with the rights of Biblical criticism was the main question at issue in the modernist movement. They will also find it hard to see how von Hügel's opinions on the Bible or on

Christology—opinions which he never retracted—can be regarded as having escaped condemnation, though it is true that he was not personally condemned.

De la Bedoyère does not appear himself to have felt at all acutely the pressure of these problems, and this is a disadvantage for any would-be interpreter of the modernist movement and in particular of von Hügel's engagement in it. Nor does he show that understanding and sympathy for Alfred Loisy, von Hügel's great friend, which is a necessary qualification in a biographer of the baron. In fact, de la Bedoyère's prejudice against Loisy causes him to do him serious injustices. Thus he alleges that in 1904 Loisy "had very long known himself to be . . . an unbeliever" (p. 162). He describes Loisy as "the cold and self-centred mocker of the fine as well as the feeble in human nature" (p. 243). On p. 130 he accuses Loisy of sneering at von Hügel, when a reference to the context shows the acusation to be quite unwarranted. Anyone who is to give a satisfactory account of the modernist movement and of von Hügel's part in it must be able to sympathize with and to do justice to all the main participants. It seems that the time has not yet come when a Roman Catholic, or perhaps anyone else, can do this.

Apart from these limitations, and the fact that the biographer is too much inclined to apologize for the baron's conduct where no apology is called for, *The Life of Baron von Hügel* deserves high praise. The baron is brought fully to life, especially by a resourceful use of extracts from his unpublished letters and diaries. Readers will share the hope, expressed in the Introduction, that a further volume of *Selected Letters* will eventually be produced, for often what is quoted here is tantalizingly brief. Unfortunately, where the biographer draws on already published sources his documentation cannot be relied on, and it is a pity that so important a book should have been so carelessly prepared for the press.[1]

[1] References are not always given where they should have been, and where they are given they have not always been verified. For instance, there are at least seven errors in the references to a single book—viz., Loisy's *Mémoires*: (1) p. 76 note 1, for "391" read "341"; (2) p. 84 note 1, for "ii, p. 157" read "i, p. 377"; (3) p. 126 note 1, there is no p. 599 in the volume referred to; (4) p. 145 note 1, for "i, p. 377" read "ii, p. 157"; (5) p. 147 note 4, for "201" read "194"; (6) p. 159 note 2, for "324" read "322"; (7) p. 227 note 1, for "ii" read "iii". There is also something wrong with note 4 on p. 129 and note 1 on p. 195.

Other corrections that should be made in the second edition are as follows. THEOLOGY has never been a "quarterly" (p. xi). Houtin is described in 1903 as an "ex-priest" on p. 32 and as a "priest" on p. 157. Gladstone's daughter was Mrs Harry (not Henry) Drew (p. 167). Le Roy's Christian name is Edouard, not Edmund (p. 241). "The Modernist Oath" (p. 249)! "Inter-communion groups" presumably mean "interdenominational groups" (p. 271). Should not "requested" read "respected" (p. 290)? What was the "Christian Social Movement" which in 1918 had an executive committee and British branches (p. 301)? The initial of the Loyson referred to on p. 59 should be given as "H", not "C" (p. 363). There are misprints on pp. 70 ("unromatic"), 86 ("overcame"), 93 ("semed"), 145 ("indirectly"), 147 n. 2 ("1913"), 156 n. 1 ("1913"), 176 ("mind"), 205 n. 1 ("charged"), 228 ("not" for "now"), 312 n. 3 insert "iii", 316 n. 3 insert "iii".

Jesus : Christ *and* Moses—I

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a commonplace of Biblical exegesis to speak of our Lord as the second Adam, the first of the New Creation and the Bridegroom of the second Eve, the Holy Church, or to call him the second David, he who is at once the Good Shepherd and the Hero King who overthrew Goliath. But it is often forgotten that a title equally primitive with these is the second Moses.

How historically true is this assumption may be seen in Dr Theodore H. Robinson's first volume of *A History of Israel*, when he says: "The Exodus was but the preliminary act in the work of Moses. There still remained his great achievement, the formation of the people of Israel. His task was to take a number of more or less isolated tribes and weld them together into a single whole, giving them an organic unity which should prove to be stronger than the claims of the old, tribal patriotism."[1]

As we look upon the history of the Christian Church, the new Israel, we see that this is what Christ has done, he has welded together a number of isolated nations into an organic unity; and even if this has succumbed to schism, so also did the earlier Israel, and yet neither the old nor the new ever completely lost the feeling and longing for the unity which it had forfeited. This unity was for the old Israel, the work of Moses, and for the new, the work of Christ.

This, however, is history and not exegesis, and it is with exegetic theology that this essay deals. There can be no doubt that an important element in the expectation of the Jews was that he who should come should be a successor to Moses. In Deuteronomy Moses is reported to have said: "Yahweh thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; according to all that thou desiredst of Yahweh thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying 'Let me not hear again the voice of Yahweh my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not.' And Yahweh said unto me, 'They have well spoken. *I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee;* and I will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.' "[2]

It is important to notice first that the revelation of the future

[1] *Op. cit.*, I, 88.

[2] Deut. 18. 15–19. Driver (I.C.C. *Deuteronomy*, p. 229) considers that this passage did not allude to any one prophet who should be like Moses, but to a succession of prophets each of whom should be his representative; but he continues: "At the same time, the terms of the description are such that it may be reasonably understood as *including* a reference to the ideal prophet Who shall be like Moses in a pre-eminent degree, in Whom the line of individual prophets should culminate and Who should exhibit the characteristics of the prophet in their fullest perfection." (The capitals are Driver's.) Whatever was the intention of the writer of Deuteronomy there can be no doubt that later generations understood him to be foretelling a single person and not a succession.

coming of the second Moses is placed here at the moment of the theophany and giving of the Laws on Horeb or Sinai, a point which will appear later to be central in our investigations. And, secondly, that the expected one was commonly alluded to as "The Prophet" or "That Prophet", and was quite distinct from "one of the prophets".[1] For though Moses is called a "prophet" in the O.T. his position is sharply contrasted with all other prophets. In Num. 12. 6–8 Yahweh says: "If there be a prophet among you I will make myself known to him in a vision. . . . My servant Moses is not so. . . . With him I will speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly and not in dark speeches; and the form of Yahweh shall he behold."

And in the last verses of Deuteronomy is said: "There arose not a prophet since in Israel, like unto Moses, whom Yahweh knew face to face, in all the signs and wonders, which Yahweh sent him to do."

That this expectation of a second Moses was current among the Jews in New Testament times we see from St Peter's speech in the Temple: "Moses indeed said, 'A prophet shall the Lord God raise up from among your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you.' . . . Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant (*παῖς*) Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities."[2]

The title "his Servant" applied by St Peter to our Lord, and mistranslated in the A.V. as "his Son", is usually taken as an illusion to the "Suffering Servant" of Deutero-Isaiah, but seems from the context rather a Mosaic allusion. Cruden says: "Moses is often by way of Eminence called 'The Servant of the Lord.' . . . This title is often given him, not only to reflect honour upon him, but also to give authority to his laws and writings in publishing of which he only acted as *God's Servant*, in his name and stead." It is true that the LXX usually renders this by *θεράπων* and *οἰκέτης*, but in Josh. 9. 24 we find Moses called *παῖς*, the word used in Acts. It is indeed possible that Deutero-Isaiah may have taken the title My Servant, and certain elements in his character, though not the whole portrait, from Moses. The following points are offered for consideration:

1. "The man Moses was very meek above all men which were upon the face of the earth!"[3] "He was oppressed, yet he humbled himself and opened not his mouth."[4]

2. Moses was a judge. The Servant "shall bring forth judgment in truth".[5]

3. Moses' treatment of Eldad and Medad: "A bruised reed shall he not break and the smoking flax shall he not quench."[6]

4. Moses was a witness to God: "Ye are my witnesses, saith Yahweh, and my servant whom I have chosen."[7]

5. Moses was chosen from birth: "Yahweh hath called me from the womb: from the bowels of my mother hath he made mention of my name."[8]

[1] Mark 6. 15. [2] Acts 3. 22–26. [3] Num. 12. 3.
[4] Isa. 53. 7. [5] Isa. 42. 3. [6] Isa. 42. 3.
[7] Isa. 43. 10. John 5. 45–46. [8] Isa. 49. 1.

6. Moses gave Israel a covenant and made them inherit new lands: "Thus saith Yahweh, I will give thee for a covenant of the people . . . to make them inherit the desolate heritages."[1]

7. Moses was not obeyed. He suffered for Israel: "All we like sheep have gone astray; and the Yahweh hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."[2]

8. Moses died and was buried in a heathen land: "They made his grave with the wicked."[3]

9. Yet Moses' work was triumphantly successful: "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Yahweh shall prosper in his hand. He shall see the travail of his soul and be satisfied."[4]

10. Moses interceded for Israel: The Servant "made intercession for the transgressors".[5]

If this were so, St Peter's use of the title Servant in this Mosaic context would look back through Deutero-Isaiah to the Pentateuch.

II. "THE ASSUMPTION OF MOSES"

Before we proceed to our Lord's acceptance of his mission as that of the second Moses, we shall consider all that remains of a little book called *The Assumption of Moses*.[6] This work, dated by scholars between A.D. 7 and A.D. 30 and recognized as undoubtedly Palestinian, illustrates a trend in current religious thought either in the time of Jesus' boyhood or of his ministry: the former is thought to be the more probable. The writer was a Pharisaic Quietist, and it is striking how closely his point of view agrees with that of our Lord, both in the Sermon on the Mount and in his apocalyptic utterances.

(i) It is remarkable that, while he treats Moses as a figure of almost superhuman grandeur and importance ("Thy sepulchre shall be from the rising of the sun to the setting, and from the south to the bounds of the north, the whole earth shall be thy sepulchre," says Joshua[7]), there is no mention of a Messiah, probably because that figure "had become associated with warlike nationalistic ideas".

(ii) Moses is *the Mediator* between God and Israel, between Israel and God, existing from all time. He says: "He [God] planned me and ordained me, who before of old, was prepared to be the mediator of his covenant."[8] Joshua says: "Moses was the great messenger, who every hour by day and night had his knees fixed to the ground, praying and beholding him who is omnipotent over the world in mercy and justice, reminding him of the covenant of the fathers, and by his oath propitiating the Lord."[9] And later, when Joshua despairs at Moses' imminent death, the latter replies comfortingly: ". . . And me he formed to pray for them and for their sins, and to intercede for them",[10] implying that his mediatorship is to last for ever.

[1] Isa. 49. 8. [2] Isa. 53. 6. [3] Isa. 53. 8–9.
[4] Isa. 53. 10–12. [5] Isa. 53. 12.
[6] The following notes are taken mainly from the introduction and edition of the text by William John Farrer (S.P.C.K., 1918).
[7] *Ass. Mos.*, 11. 7. [8] *Ibid.*, 1. 14. [9] *Ibid.*, 11. 17. [10] *Ibid.*, 12. 6.

(iii) The book emphasizes Moses as *The Prophet.* Not only does he foretell all events from the time of his death to the date it was written, but he is called "a holy spirit, manifold and incomprehensible, worthy of the Lord, master of the Word, faithful in all things, the divine Prophet of the Earth and the world's perfect teacher".[1]

(iv) As it stands, apart from the title, there is no reference to Moses' *Assumption into Heaven* except that he foretells his death and *receptio.*[2] We have, however, the evidence of Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Dydimus,[3] that the allusion in Jude 9 to the dispute between Michael and Satan is taken from the lost part of this work. From these and other patristic sources a conjectured narrative of the burial and simultaneous assumption of Moses has been arranged by M. R. James in *Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament,* pp. 48–49.

III. OUR LORD'S ACCEPTANCE OF HIS MISSION AS THE SECOND MOSES

When we bring together the scattered passages illustrating this, our Lord's accepance of his mission as the second Moses becomes quite startling.

From his childhood he had known that he had been wonderfully delivered from a tyrant, when other Hebrew children had been massacred, and that his deliverance was connected with Egypt.

The very name Jesus, or Joshua, may have suggested to him that he was to be a successor of Moses. In Ecclus. 46. 1 he may have read: "Jesus . . . was the successor of Moses in prophecies, who according to his name was made great for the saving of the elect of God."

In Deuteronomy[4] he had read that Moses had said: "When I was gone up into the mount to receive the tables of stone, even the tables of the covenant which the Lord made with you, then I abode in the mount forty days and forty nights. I did neither eat bread nor drink water." And in St Matthew we read: "Then was Jesus led up of the spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he afterward hungered."[5] The main difference between the two is that while Moses went up to receive the Law from God, our Lord went up to combat the forces of evil. The resemblances are too great, however, to overlook.

It is not explicitly stated that our Lord's retreat was in a mountain, though his being "led up" suggests it,[6] but throughout his life on earth a mountain is nearly always his place of converse with God. Indeed, a careful reading of the text suggests that there was in Galilee *some one mountain* which was the centre of his interior life on earth. Again and again, when we expect to read "a mountain", the R.V., following the Greek, gives "the Mountain". "Seeing the multitudes, he went up into the Mountain, and when he had sat down he opened his mouth and taught them."[7]

[1] *Ass. Mos.*, 11. 16. [2] *Ibid.*, 10. 12. [3] *New Commentary*, p. 646.
[4] Deut. 9. 9. [5] Matt. 4. 1–2.
[6] And St Matthew places the third temptation "on an exceeding high mountain". [7] Matt. 5. 1 and 8. 1.

"After he had sent the multitudes away [he had just fed the five thousand], he went up into the Mountain apart to pray."[1] This is no synoptic idiom, for in the same place in the fourth Gospel we read that he "withdrew to the Mountain again alone".[2]

He "came nigh unto the sea of Galilee and he went up into the Mountain and sat there, and there came to him great multitudes".[3]

"And he goeth up into the Mountain and calleth unto him whom he himself would, and he appointed twelve."[4]

"It came to pass in these days that he went out into the Mountain to pray, and he continued all night in prayer unto God."[5]

At the Transfiguration, though SS. Mark and Matthew speak of "a high mountain", St Luke says: "He took with him Peter, James, and John, and went up into the Mountain to pray."[6]

Finally, after the Resurrection, "the eleven disciples went into Galilee, into the Mountain where Jesus had appointed them",[7] and there they were given their mission to teach all nations "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you".

The conclusion is inescapable that our Lord had his Sinai or Horeb in Galilee, some mountain near the lake. Here he spent nights in contemplation. Here like Moses he gave the new Law. Here he first commissioned the apostles. Here he healed the multitudes that came to him. At the foot of this mountain he fed the people with the new manna. Here he was seen with Moses himself. And here he finally commissioned his disciples to go into all the world. This is surely the explanation of the phrase "The Holy Mount" in 2 Pet. 1. 18.

Indeed, it may be said that almost all of the Mosaic activity of Christ radiated from this mountain, and although the Sermon on the Mount is rather a collection of his utterances, yet, just as the Mosaic Law in the Pentateuch is spoken of as delivered to and by Moses in Mount Sinai, so the Law of Christ is collected together by St Matthew as if it had been delivered all at one time from his Mountain in Galilee.

A study of the Sermon on the Mount will show how Mosaic is the new Law. After the Beatitudes and the following exhortation, it is introduced with the words, "Think not that I came to destroy the Law and the Prophets. I came not to destroy but to fulfil. Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the Law till all things be accomplished." There follow the revision of the sixth and seventh Commandments and of the law against false swearing, all of which are intensified, and the laws of retribution and of loving and hating, both of which are amended, if not altogether withdrawn. Such pronouncements could be made only by one who knew himself to be the second and greater Moses. It is no wonder that his hearers "were astonished, for he taught them as having authority and not as the scribes".[8]

It was after a night spent in prayer in the Mountain that he com-

[1] Matt. 14. 23. [2] John 6. 15. [3] Matt. 15. 29. [4] Mark 3. 13.
[5] Luke 6. 12. [6] Luke 9. 28. [7] Matt. 28. 16.
[8] Matt. 5. 17–20 and Mark 1. 22.

missioned the twelve apostles. In Deuteronomy he had learnt that in Horeb Moses had been commanded to appoint judges: "So I took the heads of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you . . . and I charged the judges at that time, saying, 'Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously.' "[1] This alone can explain the words of our Lord's commission to the twelve apostles: "Ye shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."[2] And he commissioned them for the same reason and with the same words as Moses when he asked for a successor, that the congregation of Yahweh be not "as sheep which have no shepherd".[3]

If the appointment of the Twelve was a Mosaic act, so was the appointment of the Seventy.[4] "And Yahweh said unto Moses, 'Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom thou knowest to be elders of the people, and officers over them . . . and I will take of the spirit that is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee."[5] And just as this took place not on Sinai, but as the children of Israel journeyed, so St Luke puts Christ's commissioning of his Seventy in the section of the gospel dealing with the journey to Jerusalem.[6]

Closely connected with the Seventy in Numbers is the story of Eldad and Medad.[7] These men, though among the Seventy, remain in the camp instead of going to the Tabernacle to receive the Spirit, but in spite of this irregularity they prophesy. A young man reports the matter to Moses. Joshua exclaims, "My lord Moses, forbid them"; to which Moses replies, "Art thou jealous for my sake? Would God all Yahweh's people were prophets!" Very similar to this is our Lord's reply when John reported, "Master, we found one casting out devils in thy name and we forbad him because he followeth not us". But Jesus said, "Forbid him not."[8] Here is surely an instance of Christ speaking as a second Moses, which passes unrecognized by the Evangelist.

After the forty days' fasting in the wilderness the most clearly Mosaic crisis in the life of our Lord was the Transfiguration. This is traditionally placed on Mount Hermon, but, as we have seen, St Luke says it took place on "the Mountain", and the author of the Second Epistle of St Peter says "the Holy Mount". In the week that elapsed after St Peter's confession of faith at Caesarea Philippi, there would have been plenty of time for the apostolic band to walk back to Galilee. Moreover, the crowd of people awaiting him with the nine apostles when he came down from the mountain is far more typical of Galilee than of the heathen lands to the north.

Our Lord is here seen speaking with the two forerunners. In Mark it is clearly shown that St John Baptist is the second Elijah,[9] with the obvious inference, surely too obvious to express, that our Lord is

[1] Deut. 1. 15–16. [2] Matt. 19. 28 and Luke 22. 30. [3] Num. 27. 17 and Matt. 9. 36. [4] Luke 10. 1–17. [5] Num. 11. 16–17. This is not to be confused with the seventy of Ex. 24. 1. [6] Luke 9. 51—18. 44.
[7] Num. 11. 26–30. [8] Mark 9. 38 and Luke 9. 50.
[9] Mark 9. 11–13 and Matt. 17. 10–13.

the second Moses. The whole event in all the three accounts goes straight back to Ex. 24. 12–18:

> "And Moses rose up, and Joshua his minister, and Moses went up into the Mount of God. And he said unto the elders, Tarry ye here for us, until we come again unto you. . . . And Moses went up into the Mount, and the cloud covered the Mount. And the glory of Yahweh abode upon mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days; and the seventh day he called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud. . . . And Moses entered into the midst of the cloud, and went up into the Mount."

We see the selected companion, Joshua, privileged to behold the theophany, repeated by the selected three, Peter, James, and John, privileged to see the glory. We see the cloud, the Shekinah, covering Mount Sinai, and the same in Galilee, but Christ does not go alone into the cloud, for we read, "They feared as they entered into the cloud."[1] We hear again the Voice out of the cloud. But what a different message does it give! Instead of the ceremonial Law of Ex. 25, there is the proclamation that the second Moses is himself the Son of God, and that his words are all that is needed: "This is my beloved Son. Hear him."

Two other points need comment. St Matthew tells us that our Lord's "face did shine as the sun",[2] which reminds us that when Moses descended from the mount "the skin of his face did shine by reason of his speaking with Yahweh".[3] This again suggests the difference between the first and second Moses. The shining of the first Moses was a reflexion, a borrowed brilliance; that of the second was original, comparable to the sun rather than the moon. Indeed, a comparison of the two events brings this out very clearly. In Exodus the heart of the revelation is Yahweh, and the audience is Moses. In the Gospels, Christ holds the centre of the stage and the audience is the chosen three. In Exodus, Moses is left with the tables of stone. In the Gospels, the apostles are left with Jesus.

The other point is that St Luke tells us that Moses and Elijah "spake of his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem".[4] The word in the Greek is Exodus. Moses accomplished his Exodus by delivering the children of Israel from Egypt. Our Lord accomplished his by delivering us from Satan, and this he did at Jerusalem on the hill of Calvary.

CLAUDE CHAVASSE.

(*To be concluded*)

The Hymn Tune in the English Church

(S.P. = Songs of Praise; E.H. = English Hymnal; A.M.R. = Ancient and Modern, Revised 1950.)

THROUGHOUT Europe hymn singing was the popular adjunct to the struggle in the sixteenth century for the Reformation of the Church. But it is to England especially that we must look if we wish to trace the continuous development of the hymn tune. As Dr Walker

[1] Luke 9. 34. [2] Matt. 17. 2. [3] Ex. 34. 29. [4] Luke 9. 31.

says in his *History of Music in England*, "England is the only country that can show a perfectly continuous output of hymn tunes. The English Reformation gave rise to a musical literature that was far from an unworthy substitute for the noble plainsong melodies."

Before the sixteenth century, plainsong melodies had been used in the Church, not only for the Psalms and Canticles, but also for hymns. Prior to the Reformation, however, the hymns had been sung in Latin and were no more the possession of the people than the other parts of the Offices. After the Reformation a few of these hymns were translated into English. Some of these hymns are still sung to-day, and, what is more, are still sung to the original tune. "Dulcis Jesu Memoria," sung to "The Rosy Sequence" (S.P. 548, E.H. 238), though perhaps not earlier than the beginning of the sixteenth century, may be cited as an example of a pre-Reformation hymn still in use. Many of the tunes of these early Latin hymns have been preserved in the Sarum Antiphonal. In this connexion the hymn for Palm Sunday may be mentioned, "Vexilla Regis Prodeunt" (S.P. 130, E.H. 94, A.M.R. 96). The Latin hymnal may be said to have been the father of the English hymn tune. The mother of the English hymn tune was the Metrical Psalter. It was the mother who reared her very healthy child.

Six years after the publication of the Great Bible—that is to say, in 1545—Thomas Sternhold, Groom of the King's Majesty's Robes, published nineteen Psalms in metre. This, the earliest Metrical Psalter, was dedicated to Henry VIII, who, as the title-page declares, "had taken pleasure in hearing the Author sing these novel psalms to an organ accompaniment". Four years later, under Edward VI, Sternhold published an enlarged edition containing thirty-seven Psalms. Later editions of Sternhold, published after his death, contained versions by other authors, notably John Hopkins. The English hymn tune had its beginning in the musical editions of the Metrical Psalters. Numerous tunes were required for the metrical Psalms. Whence were these tunes derived?

Prior to the Reformation, and growing up independently of the Church, was the carol. Differing markedly from plainsong, the carol bears strong resemblance to the hymn tune of later times. Originally the carol sprang from the folk-tune, and for that reason it was always popular. Carols were sung not at Christmas only but at all seasons. There were carols for Easter and Whitsun. There were also secular carols. The tune now sung to the words "Good King Wenceslas" was originally the tune for a spring carol. As an example of a Christmas carol, the tune "This Endrys Night" may be chosen (S.P. 72, E.H. 20). It belongs to the fifteenth century. Tunes of this character (A.M.R. 58 and 337), already popular outside the Church, were brought into the Church to meet the demand for tunes to sing to the Metrical Psalms. Folk-songs and love songs were also introduced. How else was this sudden and unexpected need for popular tunes to be met? Some of these songs were brought to this country from the Continent. For instance, the tune "Orientis Partibus" (S.P. 153, E.H. 129, A.M.R. 524) was derived from a French folk-tune which may

have been sung by the troubadours. It is known to have been used in the year 1222 at the cathedral of Sens. As there used, the words and tune formed part of a humorous prologue staged outside the cathedral door.

As an example of a love song transformed into a sedate hymn tune, the "Old Hundredth" may be cited. Originally a French love song, this tune was introduced into the Geneva Psalter by Bourgeois, and later taken over, with a number of other tunes, by the English Protestants during their exile in Geneva. When Mary came to the throne, hymn singing, which had been associated with Reforming zeal, received a severe set-back. From 1553 to 1558 the Metrical Psalter was banned in this country. At Geneva, however, the exiled Reformers found a French Metrical Psalter in use with a proper tune for each Psalm. Louis Bourgeois was responsible for the musical settings in this Geneva Psalter and some of the tunes were his own composition. These tunes had a marked effect upon all subsequent editions of the Metrical Psalter in this country. A typical example of the type of tune introduced from Geneva is the Proper Tune to Psalm 42 (S.P. 291, E.H. 200, A.M.R. 523).

In Elizabeth's reign, however, when the Metrical Psalter returned to this country, there were musicians of great ability within the Church, notably Thomas Tallis and Christopher Tye, who were supplying from within the Church distinctively church music to be sung to the new versions of the Psalms in metre. Two of Tallis's tunes, the "Ordinal" and the "Canon", are sung frequently in all churches. These tunes with seven others were first published in 1560 in an edition of metrical Psalms published privately by Archbishop Parker. Strangely enough, the first Metrical Psalter with tunes to be published in this country was this version by Parker and not the version by Sternhold.

The people were still familiar with the Plainsong modes, and Tallis composed nine tunes based upon these modes. As an example, "The First Mode Melody" may be chosen (S.P. 625, E.H. 78, A.M.R. 106). Tallis composed his tunes with the melody in the tenor. "The Third Mode Melody" is given in its original form with the melody in the tenor, and also in its later form with the melody in the soprano (S.P. 675, E.H. 92, A.M.R. 53 and 62). The tunes written by Tallis for the Metrical Psalms, being influenced by the plainsong formerly used in the Church, show a rhythm that cannot be confined to measurement by bars, and is broken by what we now call syncopation. Notice, for instance, the rhythm in Tallis's "Lamentations" (S.P. 235, E.H. 235).

Hymn singing, although associated with the Reformation, was not looked upon with favour by the Puritans. Their disapproval was due in part, no doubt, to the secular origin of many of the tunes. In face of the scruples of the Puritans, Elizabeth issued an injunction concerning hymns. The injunction ran:

"For the comforting of such that delight in music, it may be permitted that in the beginning and in the end of Common Prayer either at Morning or Evening, there may be sung an hymn or such

like Song to the praise of Almighty God in the best melody and music that may be conveniently devised having respect that the sentence of the hymn may be understanded and perceived."

Hymn singing, however, was severely restricted by the Calvinistic rule that nothing might be sung except what was taken from Scripture. According to this rule, nothing could be sung other than the Psalms, unless other portions of Scripture were, like the Psalms, rendered into metrical form. That a metrical paraphrase of the "Acts of the Apostles" should have been sung will hardly surprise us, when we learn that even the genealogical tables were cast into verse and set to music. The music for the "Acts" was composed by Christopher Tye. Day's Psalter, published in 1562, became the standard edition of Sternhold and Hopkins. It was later known as the "Old Version'. It is to our purpose to notice that this edition contained five hymns with tunes. The Metrical Psalter carried within its womb the growing child that was to become a hymn book. As an example of the hymns published in the Complete Psalter, John Marckant's hymn may be cited. It is now sung to a tune which, in its present form, is given in Playford's Psalter of 1667 (S.P. 116, E.H. 84, A.M.R. 93).

One year after the publication of the standard edition of the Sternhold and Hopkins Psalter, Day, the printer, published an edition with four-part musical settings, and, while retaining all the tunes of the earlier edition, he ventured to give two or three alternative tunes for some of the Psalms and added five entirely new tunes. Frere speaks of this edition of the Psalter as "the first harmonized hymn book of the English Church". The music in this edition was under the care of William Parsons, who sought the help of Thomas Causton. Six hymn tunes in frequent use to-day made their first appearance in this edition. The best known is "St Flavian", the tune set to Psalm 132 (S.P. 188, E.H. 161, A.M.R. 159). Day's edition of Sternhold and Hopkins held the field for nearly thirty years. Issue after issue was called for. The issue of Day's Psalter dated 1566 is of special interest because it contained the Queen's Licence, which read: "allowed to be sung of the people, in Churches, before and after Morning and Evening Prayer, as also before and after the Sermon, and moreover, in private houses".

In 1591 Damon published an edition of the Metrical Psalter in two books, one book gave the melody in the tenor, the other gave the melody in the treble. Damon's Psalter is further evidence that the people were becoming less musically adept. Damon recognized that many people using the Psalter in the home were no longer able to sing a fa-bourdon. Only one year later, Este published a Psalter with the melody firmly established in the treble, and this Psalter held the field for the next thirty years. In Este's Psalter a further simplification of the music is noticeable. Instead of tunes in double common metre Damon had introduced four-line tunes. In this innovation, too, Este followed Damon, and these simple common metre tunes came to be known as Church Tunes. One of the earliest of these Church Tunes is "Southwell" (S.P. 106, E.H. 77, A.M.R. 122). It first appeared in Damon's Psalter. The best known of the Church

Tunes introduced in Este's Psalter is "Winchester Old", set to Psalm 84 (S.P. 82, E.H. 30, A.M.R. 62).

Thomas Campion's *First Book of Ayres*, published in 1613, shows the influence of the madrigal in the loosening of the rigid form imposed in the Church Tunes. Thomas Campion wrote the words and composed the music for such hymns as "The Weather-beaten Sail" (S.P. 567) and "The Song of Joy" (S.P. 639). The best-known tune from this important book is "Babylon's Streams" (S.P. 124, E.H. 487, A.M.R. 228). These tunes, it is to be observed, were composed for hymns and not for Metrical Psalms. This is an advance in the history of the hymn tune.

Ravenscroft's Psalter, published in 1621, represents musically the final stand of the "Old Version"—that is to say, the Sternhold and Hopkins Psalter. Ravenscroft attempted to call back the psalm singers into the old paths by giving familiar tunes, such as Bristol, Winchester, and St Flavian, with fa-bourdon settings. As an example of the type of new tune introduced by Ravenscroft the "Old 104th" may be cited (S.P. 211, E.H. 178, A.M.R. 167).

Two years after Ravenscroft's Psalter, the first hymn book came to birth. *Hymns and Songs of the Church*, edited by Withers and published in 1623, is of importance not only because it is the earliest hymn book, but also because it contained no fewer than sixteen tunes by Orlando Gibbons. These tunes owe something to the liberating effect of Campion's hymns and tunes, and while they recall the noble severity of Tallis and Tye, they anticipate the more graceful tunes of Clarke and Croft. Frere describes Orlando Gibbons as "one of the greatest of English musicians and composers". Examples of his Angel Songs, chosen to illustrate various types of tune, are: Song 34 (S.P. 29, E.H. 259, A.M.R. 336), Song 1 (S.P. 485, E.H. 302, A.M.R. 402), Song 5 (S.P. 648, E.H. 483, AM.R. 164).

With Gibbons the hymn tune, as distinct from the tune for a metrical Psalm, had fully emerged. Hitherto the dominance of the metrical Psalms had arrested the growth of the hymn tune. The metrical Psalms had, however, called forth tunes of high excellence which were later used as hymn tunes. During the Commonwealth, when Puritanism was in the ascendency, the metrical version of the Psalms, which had been popular for a full century, was ruthlessly swept aside. It was an age of austerity in life and in worship. It was not, however, an altogether unmusical age. Henry Lawes, for instance, was a very good musician. His tune "Whitehall" (S.P. 589, E.H. 234, A.M.R. 525) may serve as a reminder that even this drab period contributed something of excellence to church music. And, in passing, we must notice that the English hymn tune was not altogether uninfluenced by the Scottish Psalter. A valuable contribution from Presbyterianism to the English Church is to be recognized in such tunes as "Martyrs" (S.P. 597, E.H. 449, A.M.R. 309). But, generally speaking, the level of church music was deplorably low during the Commonwealth. Long after the Restoration the ill-effects of the Calvinistic dominance in the Church were still evident in the greatly lowered standard of musical appreciation and attainment.

Recovery was very slow. Organs had been destroyed, choirs disbanded, and much of the music stored in cathedrals and parish churches burnt. The tradition of English church music might have been utterly lost had the Calvinistic ascendency continued for many more years. Fortunately, when the monarchy was restored, members of the disbanded choirs still remembered much of the old music. Some of them had taken old choir books away from the churches and hidden them. But, as John Playford wrote in 1671, "at this time the best and almost all the choice tunes are lost and out of use in our Churches". The quotation is from the first edition of Playford's Psalter. Playford published his edition of Sternhold and Hopkins with the laudable intention of raising the standard of church music. The melody is restored to the tenor. A footnote, however, explains that the trebles may sing the melody an octave higher. Playford lowered the standard of his music by comparison with earlier editions of the Metrical Psalter, but he hoped to raise the level of the music at least to the standard he had set. In this hope, however, he was disappointed. The concessions which he had made to the unmusical singers in the churches were not sufficient to gain a popular reception for his book. Six years later, therefore—that is to say, in the year 1677—he brought out an edition which omitted most of the new tunes and further lowered the standard demanded in singing the tunes that remained. Commenting on this book, Frere says: "The best musical traditions were gone." Such was the effect of excessive Puritanism. In Playford's second Psalter the melody was no longer in the tenor and the harmony was supplied for three parts only. Commenting further on this book, Frere says: Playford "gauged his public well and made sufficient sacrifices to save his cargo". But what a sorry falling off from the edition published by Day in 1563! Playford's second edition of Sternhold and Hopkins, issued just over a hundred years after Day's Complete Psalter, is important because it marks the end of what had its beginning in Day's edition. Playford's second edition was the last edition of Sternhold and Hopkins to be published. Twenty years later—that is to say, in 1696—a new version of the Psalms in metre was issued. The metrical paraphrases in this new version were written by Tate and Brady. The authors of this new version did not anticipate that their paraphrases would supplant those in the old version. The old version had been in use for more than a century. The new version was offered merely as an alternative. In course of time, however, Tate and Brady entirely superseded Sternhold and Hopkins.

It is to our purpose to notice that the new version of the Metrical Psalter contained not only tunes to be sung to the Psalms, but also hymn tunes. The edition of Tate and Brady issued in 1708 had an number of entirely new tunes, including "St Ann", "St Matthew", and "Hanover", all composed by William Croft (S.P. 598, 287, 618; E.H. 450, 526, 466; A.M.R. 165, 478, 506). These tunes were taken from a book published in 1701 entitled *The Divine Companion, or David's Harp New Tuned.* This important book was edited by Henry Playford (son of John Playford already mentioned). In addi-

tion to the tunes by Croft there were also tunes by Jeremiah Clarke. Clarke deserves special notice because, according to Robert Bridges, he is the father of the hymn tune in its present form. His best hymn tunes are "Tunbridge" and "Uffingham" (S.P. 474, 564; E.H. 88, 434; A.M.R. 344, 274). His best-known tune is "St Magnus" (S.P. 175, E.H. 147, A.M.R. 218).

At this point it is pleasing to recall that the singing of children played a very important part in the history of the hymn tune. The eighteenth century saw the foundation of three famous orphanages. In 1746 the Lock Hospital was founded by Martin Madan. Formerly a barrister-at-law, Madan was converted by John Wesley and afterwards received ordination in the Church of England and became chaplain of the hospital which he founded. He was musically gifted and taught the children singing. In 1769 he published a collection of Psalm and Hymn Tunes sung by the Children of the Lock Hospital. The book contained a tune by Charles Lockhart, the blind organist of the Hospital chapel. This tune, "Carlisle", has recently become deservedly popular (S.P. 458, E.H. 190, A.M.R. 362). In addition to the Lock Hospital, there was also at this time the Hospital for Female Orphans. The best-known of the three, however, was the famous Foundling Hospital instituted in 1738 by Captain Coram. One of the tunes sung at the Foundling in these early days is still sung to-day (A.M.R. 153).

The standard of hymn singing at this period was deplorably low. The standard was raised as a result of the singing of the children in the orphanages. In 1782 the children from the three orphanages gathered in St Paul's Cathedral to sing the hymns which they used in their own Services. This great gathering of charity children was an outstanding event every year from 1782 till 1877. The singing of these children greatly increased the popularity of good hymn tunes and set an example showing how the tunes ought to be sung.

A generation later came Samuel Sebastian Wesley, who was no unworthy successor of Tallis, Gibbons, and Clarke. He represents nineteenth-century church music at its zenith. His best-known tune is "Aurelia" (S.P. 249, E.H. 489, A.M.R. 255). After years of neglect, "Herewood" is again coming into favour (S.P. 464, E.H. 239, A.M.R. 243) and also "Hereford" (A.M.R. 329).

After Wesley there was a bad period for a whole generation. The years between 1860 and 1890 mark the low tide of English church music. Hymn tunes in plenty were composed during this period, but, with a few exceptions, they are now recognized to be of poor quality. Speaking of Victorian church music, Dr Walker says: "The composers of hymn tunes led the way to the easy popularity of inferior sentimentalism." Until quite recent years, however, all the hymn books used in the church gave a vastly disproportionate place to tunes composed during this period. Reform came at the beginning of the present century, and some modern hymn tunes are not unworthy of the glorious inheritance of English church music. It is not possible to speak of modern hymn tunes without mentioning "Alberta", by William Harris (S.P. 554, A.M.R. 298). Many examples

might be given. It must suffice to refer only to "Veryan", by G. H. Knight (A.M.R. 9); "Naphill", by H. E. Darke (A.M.R. 155); "Farmborough", by A. Warrell (S.P. 689, E.H. 509); and for strong, vigorous tunes—"Ladywell", by W. H. Ferguson (A.M.R. 297), and "Abbot's Leigh", by C. V. Taylor (A.M.R. 257). No other Church in Christendom has so rich a store of good hymn tunes as the Church of England. Let us not fail to treasure as we ought our rich inheritance.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

Great Preachers—VI. Dean Church

THE sermons of Dean Church have the quiet tone, the moral earnestness, and the intellectual distinction, which were characteristic of the Oxford movement in its early days. The lucidity and insight of Newman's preaching, and the sober piety of the Christian year, were great gifts to English Christianity, and Church in large measure shared them. He had also the judgment and wide knowledge of an historian, so that when in later life, at Oxford or St Paul's, he spoke on the influence of Christianity on civilization and human society, his views had authority and commanded attention.

Among his pastoral addresses are three volumes of *Village Sermons* delivered during his eighteen years at Whatley, one volume of *Cathedral and University Sermons*, and another entitled *The Discipline of the Christian Character*. These are all published by Macmillan, and may easily be obtained from second-hand bookshops. To this group also belongs the small volume of Christmas sermons entitled *The Message of Peace*, published by S.P.C.K. The second group of sermons, less pastoral in purpose, contains three more volumes published by Macmillan—*The Gifts of Civilisation, Human Life and its Conditions, Pascal and other sermons*. The first two of these are concerned with the social influence of Christianity, while the third includes three notable sermons on Pascal, Bishop Butler, and Bishop Andrewes.

The parish priest who reads other men's sermons, mainly with the laudable desire to improve his own, will find most to help him in the *Village Sermons*. They are a useful quarry for weekly preaching, and a source of spiritual nourishment to those who will take the trouble to read them.

Whatley, where they were preached, was "a little village of two hundred people, wholly agricultural in its occupations, lying in the midst of the rich Somersetshire pasture country, twelve miles from Wells, and three miles from Frome, its nearest market town". Church settled there in 1852, after the storms of the Oxford movement had carried his close friend, Newman, into the Church of Rome. He had had no training in pastoral work, and little experience of it, when he began his ministry in this tiny village with its derelict rectory and church, which for many years had been without a resident rector. His flock were, and remained, something of a mystery to him. He never found it easy to talk to them.

"After four years' trial I know as little how to go about it satis-

factorily, and still read with wonder and admiration any small book which describes the easy-going, glib, persuasive way in which the typical parson is painted talking to the members of his flock. To me they seem to live in impenetrable shells of their own; now and then you seem to pinch them or please them, but I can never find out the rule that either goes by."

How did he try from the pulpit to pierce the impenetrable shells? First, he was able to arouse awe in the presence of Christian dogma. He conveys in simple words something of his own wonder and amazement at what God has done for us in Jesus. The Incarnation is "that mighty and inconceivable act, the Word made flesh". It is "such a thing as heaven and earth may well wonder at for ever and ever".

Here is the way in which he speaks of it to his people on Christmas morning:

"Look at the world around you, and all that is in it—all the countless millions of living souls that are in it, that have lived and died in it since it was first made; look up at the sky, and count the stars, and remember that each star is a world, and think who it is who made and upholds all these, and knows what is going on in every corner of them; and then imagine that Being clothed in flesh, standing a man at your side. . . . Take in that thought, fix your mind on it, try to get hold of something of its surpassing wonderfulness; and, after it, all other wonders seem hardly worth naming."

In contrast to this awed and joyful acknowledgment of the love of God, there broods over all the sermons a sense of the sadness and desolation of the world without him, of humanity so injured that it is hard for us to remember even the simplest truth of faith. "How difficult really to believe, to remember that we are citizens of a heavenly country, that there is really another world of much more consequence to us than this one, which now fills up all our thoughts and takes up all our time."

It is helpful to remember that these sermons were delivered in the disappointment which often attends the pastoral ministry. The Rector of Whatley cared deeply for his people; his farewell sermon is a remarkable expression of pastoral love. His sadness at their neglect of his ministrations is expressed once, and only once, in a sermon on Ascension Day:

"Shall I tell you what is the most painful hour of the week to me? the hour that, week by week, makes me feel that all I have said has been wasted, and done no good? that makes me doubt whether I am doing any good here? It is the time when I come into church on Sunday morning and see it so empty of worshippers, and think of the reasons which keep them away, and of the dishonour done to our Almighty Father. I know indeed, better than any of you can, how awful is the thought of that account and reckoning which I must one day give for you, before the judgment seat of God. But, dear brethren, remember this, that my fault will not excuse you,—will not make it right for you to do dishonour to God, and slight his means of grace."

Although the parish priest will find this first group of sermons most useful, it was doubtless on the sermons of the second group, delivered at Oxford and St Paul's, that Church's reputation, in his own day, was founded. Scott Holland has told us something of his character and style of preaching in these later years:

"Even his sermons, into which he was careful to put his best work, and which possessed for those who had ears to hear such incomparable charm, were not calculated to reach the multitude. There were no physical effects to aid the impression. The voice, though pure-toned, was far from strong; and in delivery he held fast to the earlier traditions so characteristic of Newman and the Tractarian chiefs. Gesture, action, were all rigidly discarded; and the voice retained its even measured monotone throughout. Again, he hardly ever preached on public occasions except where his duties compelled him; and this meant, in general, his rare sermons as Dean, and still rarer as University preacher. He never would let himself go out to meet the general attention."

Another comment from the same writer is valuable: "He possessed judgment; that is what we should begin by saying of him, if anyone asked why we thought him so great." It is just this quality of judgment which gives distinction to these sermons—the same quality which we find in his books on the Oxford movement and St Anselm. His contemporaries were also attracted by his insight into the achievements of human society. He had an historical sense of the greatness and value of civilization. He could understand how the ordinary labours of a statesman, a man of business, a scientist, were valuable and satisfying in themselves, considered apart from any religious motive or belief. Nemesis had not yet overtaken Victorian England; its progress and achievements were impressive, and there was an audience for a preacher who could appreciate this excellence, without sharing the conviction that religion was useless to a society which could do so much for itself.

He maintained that, in two respects, any civilization, even the highest, was impotent. No society without religion could promote chastity or nourish the hope of another life. Certain virtues—honesty, trust, truthfulness, diligence, courage—might be naturally encouraged by a society on its way to complexity and secular excellence. No doubt the presence of Christianity in such a society had contributed to its stock of virtue. Still, society itself tended to promote certain virtues apart from religion. But the one virtue which it could not promote, and without which it could become unbearable, was chastity. Christianity away, the licence of paganism might soon return to trouble the peace of the most prosperous and civilized community. What was to hinder it? Also, since the tendency of society was to absorb the whole of human strength in the pursuit of temporal good, how should any civilization suggest horizons beyond itself? On the contrary, it brings about a concentration of purpose, narrow and in the last resort futile. For however noble may be those temporal objectives which communities and individuals pursue, "there is this to be said of them, they are passing away." The sen-

tence of death under which they lie will in the long run take the heart out of those who are striving to attain them, unless they are sustained by another hope.

All this amounts to something more than a plain condemnation or uncritical acceptance of human achievements in society. We have in Church's work the balanced judgment of a Christian historian and man of letters, who was forced by temperament and external pressures to consider these great issues. Times have changed since he did so; but his sermons still read well, his judgments stand, and he remains our teacher.

A. C. Scupholme.

On the Gentiles Also?

"And they . . . which believed were astonished . . . because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 10. 45).

Our Joe works at a garage. He was baptized as an infant, confirmed at the age of twelve, and is now twenty. He hasn't been to church since they buried his uncle Jack three years since. And should the clergyman by chance visit his home when he is in (an unlikely chance, since there are some four thousand other homes in the parish) Our Joe will shout for mother and slide out of the back door without apology.

Saturday afternoon, Joe watches the home side against Bolton or Blackpool or whoever it may be. The arena of professional football to-day may not seem a particularly promising field for the activity of the Holy Spirit. Yet he is there, working to protect and guide his own into all truth. In the first place, as Bertrand Russell pointed out in his Reith Lectures, football would be a particularly unpleasant game if all the members of the losing side were to forfeit their lives at the end of the game. Just such an unpleasant game was current before the Holy Spirit used the Church to influence the mass-production of professional sport. It was wild beasts and gladiators on which the young mechanics and their girl friends would put their money in ancient Rome—until a monk jumped down to a voluntary death in the arena and at last the whole ghastly business was finished with. Of course, all the members of the losing side did not normally forfeit their lives. Common humanity was too strong and professional gladiators too precious. But some did. Thanks to the action of the Holy Spirit upon his own Our Joe is not tempted every Saturday afternoon to dissipate such holiness as God has given him in a wholesale indulgence of blood lust and cruelty.

But God does more than this for Our Joe. Imagine that a favourite player deliberately and scientifically puts an unwary opponent out of action with an expert tap on the inside of the knee. Here indeed is an unpromising situation from which to produce the fruits of holiness. But even this God may turn to his praise. Joe may experience, though he would not call it that, an acute if short-lived moral crisis. He is glad indeed that a dangerous opponent is for five or ten

vital minutes rendered less dangerous. He is glad, particularly if he should have money, even only part of a sixpenny postal order, on the result. But he is vexed at the defect in what he knows as "sporting play". And sporting or fair play is a reflexion in man, however dim and partial, of the glorious justice and mercy of the blessed God. Unless the foul is a particularly dirty and obvious one, Joe will probably make no demonstration against it; but his respect for the offending player may sensibly diminish. But if there is anything of the martyr in him (there is in many folk) he may even be inspired to growl out the word "Foul!" Momentarily at least he will draw down upon himself the surprised contempt of his fellow-supporters in the stand. And there is fulfilment, obscure, partial, diffuse, feeble, soon forgotten indeed, but fulfilment of the word of Jesus (Luke 6. 22): "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company. . . ." There remains a living flame of holiness in Joe, member of God's holy nation. For the Holy Spirit has him in his care.

Saturday evenings Joe usually takes his popsy to the dance hall down by the gasworks. They have been going for some months now. Tuesday and Thursday are usually "the pictures" and the holding of hands. But Saturday is the dance, cheek to cheek. Account in what sociological terms you please for this pattern of behaviour. All Joe and his popsy know is that they like dancing because it is "nice". Usually they don't stay very late. It is round about half-past ten when they are walking home, the long way round. And at every jaunty step her long flame-coloured plastic mac, skilfully buttoned and belted about her trim figure, glitters like molten gold under the dull glare of the street lamps.

To the Puritan (and surely there is a puritan strain in every serious student of theology) the situation might again seem distinctly unpromising. There are far wiser ways for a young man to spend his Saturday afternoon than in watching professional football, and, after five days spent largely with plugs and piston-rings and other such stuff, there may well be wiser ways of spending the evening of the sixth than in a cheap dance hall in the company of a pretty young girl, erotically if not altogether tastefully "dressed up to kill". But it remains true that the situation has greater possibilities of holiness than that of the afternoon. God Incarnate, Jesus Christ, was the friend of publicans and sinners, or as we might say nowadays, of contact men, traitors, and prostitutes. He is as surely the friend of garage hands and shorthand typists in the pride of their young lives.

Very probably the Holy Spirit has ruled out one of the three main lines of conduct open to Joe on the long way home. Before he had injected a measure of his gift of love into the mass entertainment of "civilized" society, gladiatorial shows supplied the need now largely met by professional football. Before he had injected a measure of his gift of love into the conventions of personal morality, the natural, obvious conclusion to the evening's entertainment might well have been retirement to a private cubicle in the nearest pub to complete it. The social services at Pompeii, the novels of Petronius,

and the equivocal meaning of the very word "taberna" (inn and brothel)—such things confirm our estimate of what would have been probable then, but is now unlikely. Throughout her existence the Church, the New Israel, has stood more or less effective watchdog over the moral deposit of the Old, the law of Moses. Before the Reformation stained-glass windows of the Last Judgment (or, as in Ely Cathedral, sculptured devils guarding the approach to the holy table) have, once a week for the most part, warned off Joe's ancestors from the more obvious deadly sins. Since the Reformation the same function has been assumed by the words "Thou shalt not commit adultery", written in letters of faded gold, along with the other nine commandments, above that same holy table. While Bolton was but a village and Blackpool a stretch of sand, those words, laboriously scanned from childhood to old age through many a weary sermon, have burned themselves deep into the moral consciousness of our society. They have been loosely interpreted. Joe and his popsy, we may with some caution assume, will not, as they would put it, "do anything wrong".

In general two alternatives remain—an orderly, respectable procession homewards, possibly silent and charged with emotional tension; or a wordless breakaway into a convenient shop entrance for a lingering, passionate embrace. They may have done this latter before, perhaps with other partners. If so they will the more probably do it this time. In any case, they will have seen it worked out often enough at the pictures.

Through either alternative the Holy Spirit may work his gracious purpose. The "royal law of love" (Rom. 13. 10; Jas. 2. 8), in so far as we may apply it to this situation, is neatly illustrated in a poem by Nicholas Breton (1545–1626). Phyllida and Corydon have been for a walk in the woods, the approximate equivalent in the pastoral convention to the walk home from the half-crown dance hall of our situation. The lovers pause:

> Corydon would kiss her then;
> She said maids must kiss no men
> Till they did for good and all.
> Then she made the shepherd call
> All the heavens to witness truth
> Never loved a truer youth.

The poem proceeds swiftly and gracefully to its appointed end. At last—

> Love which had been long deluded
> Was with kisses sweet concluded.

Perhaps it is so with Joe and his girl. Perhaps they are truly in love, a love ripe for declaration in word or, quasi-sacramentally, for sealing in kisses. Let them not miss the precious joy of that moment. It is God's gift and God's will for them. More probably (for was not Joe alone and apparently content at the football match?) they are not so in love, or at least not yet. Then the desire engendered by the situation will probably be inordinate and its expression to be restrained. Blessed is the man who is able truthfully to say to his be-

loved that he has never kissed another woman with desire. A measure of cowardice may lie behind that ability—but a measure of purity too, the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Whether, then, Joe restrains the expression of his desire, or offers that expression to his girl, it may be that the Holy Spirit is holding him up, to be a mirror of the divine love. Sensual and earthy is Our Joe—as are we all—yet by the creator spirit formed in the image of God.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery." The hope has been expressed that the Holy Spirit will be able to protect Joe and his girl from "doing anything wrong". "But I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. 5. 27). Neither in form nor in content is our Lord here proclaiming a new law for some remote Utopia; though the First Gospel's schema of five blocks of sayings, corresponding to the books of the Pentateuch, has often suggested this interpretation. No, in these words he makes a practical statement of fact. A natural consequence of the look is, as he says, the act. And this natural consequence would become more generally the actual one if the checks and inhibitions which the Holy Spirit imposes upon society through the leaven of his church were suddenly or gradually withdrawn. The truth of our Lord's statement of fact Joe may obscurely recognize, particularly if his courtship has made any considerable progress, in some such words as "one thing leads to another". Through that recognition the Holy Spirit may lead him to some approximation of obedience to our Lord's wisdom. On the one hand, the God-given knowledge that "one thing leads to another" may help him to restrain the expression of his desire. On the other, if they are both truly in love (that love, I mean, which leads to marriage), he may bear his witness to the truth of our Lord's words in the positive action of a limited courtship. If it is already adultery to look upon a woman with lust it is already marriage to look upon her with the love that is committed or is being committed to marriage. Beauty, neither earthy nor merely sensual, there may well be, either in the restraint or in the expression of his desire. Through respect for and love of the creature Our Joe may be drawn nearer to worship and love of the Creator. From such a less-than-conscious doing of God's will, the Holy Spirit may lead Our Joe to the gates of the kingdom of heaven.

The situation has been grossly over-simplified. The Holy Spirit may act in such a situation in ways beyond our understanding, ways exhaustless in their subtlety. Moreover, by design the girl has not even been given a name. Her anonymity represents a deliberate elimination of her part in the matter. What was in her mind when she rushed her tea the more securely to put on those amber earrings, that mask of dead-white powder and paint, that brilliant artificial mouth? What reserves of passion, what reserves of modesty lie behind those smiling lips, that cool, level gaze? It takes three to make love as it takes three to make marriage, with God, recognized or not, as the first.

Are we, which believe, astonished because that on the Gentiles also is poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost? In Spirit and in truth the Cross of Jesus goeth on before in Joe's world of popsies, pictures, and pools. The Holy Spirit has indeed got among those who ignore the laws and customs of the New Israel. But are the theologians following in the van, armed with dramatic insight as well as scientific method, to find him there?

A. H. Dammers.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. C. Chavasse is Vicar of Kidlington, Oxford.
Dr Valentine is Vicar of Highbrook, Sussex.
The Rev. A. C. Scupholme is Rector of Thurcaston, Leicester.
The Rev. A. H. Dammers is Assistant Curate of Edgbaston Old Church and Lecturer at the Queen's College, Birmingham.

CORRESPONDENCE

FUNERALS

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

As a minister of the Church of Scotland I am not concerned in the domestic issues raised by Mr Wild's article on "Funerals" in your May issue. But uneasiness regarding the conduct of services on these occasions, lest they reflect insincerity on the part of the clergyman or disseminate false ideas of Christian faith and hope, is not confined to Mr Wild's own Church. I write to raise one matter only, to suggest that he make explicit the grounds of his strongly held objection to the use in connexion with the burial of the dead of the Lections from Revelation chapters 7 and 21 permitted as alternatives in the 1928 form of the Book of Common Prayer. These are in common use at funeral services in my own communion; and if he can show just cause why they may not be used with edification in his Church I imagine some of us others would be at least interested and perhaps equally concerned.

Does Mr Wild suggest that the doctrine of the Apocalypse of St John is of questionable orthodoxy? There have been those who honestly thought its inclusion in the N.T. Canon unfortunate! Is it on any ambiguity in the reference of St John's visions of the Heavenly City that he founds his objection—e.g., whether it is a transcendent other world beyond space and time or a post-millennial transformation of this present world that is envisaged? Commonly, I would suggest, they are read (by the clergyman, whether also understood by the congregation) in a sense suspending this antithesis, as a symbolic picture of the Consummation of All Things, when God shall be all in all (to use the language of the 1 Corinthians Lection, which Mr Wild considers "safe"). Or does Mr Wild think it improper to dwell even on a symbolic picture of the Consummation,

on the joys and glories of the Heavenly Jerusalem, at a funeral? that we should rather stop short at the affirmation of the Resurrection of the Dead and the Life of the World to come? It may be that the reading of the Revelation passages encourages an easy belief that the persons mourned on these occasions have already entered upon these rewards; thus anticipating the Resurrection at the Last Day and the Final Judgment (or even eliminating these!). But is not the 1 Corinthians Lection open to misconstruction? Has the deceased indeed "died in Christ"? Have the mourners that faith for which "death is swallowed up in victory"? The prayers of the service admirably keep to conditionals: ". . . our hope is this our brother doth . . . rest in Christ"; petition is made for the "speedy accomplishment of the number of the elect" and the "hastening of Thy Kingdom". But the Revelation Lections are far from teaching an easy-going Universalism. That vexed question apart, it seems to me that the reading of St John's visions of the Heavenly City and the qualifications and occupations of its inhabitants may perform on occasion the evangelical function of prompting the mind and conscience of attenders upon funerals to ponder within themselves whether they are likely to be found therein.

If I have completely misconstrued what is in Mr Wild's mind, he will forgive me, and perhaps go on to state what is!

The Manse,
Colmonell,
Girvan, Ayrshire.
4 *May* 1951.

I am, Sir,
Yours truly,
James Brown.

THE EVENING SACRIFICE

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Mr Dahl in his article on "The Evening Sacrifice" in the April number of Theology speaks of St Augustine "defending the practice of having the Eucharist before supper but after lunch, as is the practice of the African Church". This is surely misleading, because St Augustine is dealing with what he regards as the one exception to the rule of the Universal Church, which is that "in honour of so great a sacrament the Lord's Body should enter the mouth of a Christian before all other foods" (*Ep. to Januarius*, Ep. 54, § 8). This exception takes place on Maundy Thursday, on which, "according to an approved opinion (*probabilis quaedam ratio*), for the more signal commemoration (of the Last Supper) the Body and Blood of the Lord are allowed to be offered and received after food". Mr Dahl adds: "St Ambrose one finds taking an evening Eucharist for granted." He gives no reference, but presumably has in mind the commentary on Ps. 118, § 48, when St Ambrose speaks of "the oblation being celebrated *meridianis horis* (in the middle of the day), and further mentions a *sacrificium vespertinum* (evening sacrifice)."

The context, however, shows that he is referring to a Eucharist offered on fast days, which was customary either at 3 o'clock in the afternoon or at sunset. He assumes, however, that those communicating at such Eucharists will be fasting, for he says: "A fast is appointed; beware of neglecting it. And if hunger drives thee to the daily meal (*prandium*) or intemperance refuses the fast; nevertheless preserve thyself (i.e. by fasting) for the heavenly banquet."

On the whole question Fr Puller's tract on *Concerning the Fast before Communion* (Mowbray, 1928) should be consulted, the main contentions of which stand firm, in spite of the passage from St Chrysostom being now considered spurious, and the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus confirming the view that the Eucharist is to be received before other foods, not as St Augustine says for the honour of the sacraments, but as a protection against dangers.

Yours faithfully,

H. Edward Symonds, C.R.

The Priory,
Rosettenville,
Johannesburg.
4 *May* 1951.

SHOULD A CHRISTIAN BE A FREEMASON?

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

How far Mr Dart invites confidence in his general statements it is hardly for me to say, but as a Roman Catholic I would not hesitate to say that every time he refers to Rome and the Pope, he is wrong.

When did the Pope say that when organizing works of mercy it is wrong to pray with Muslims, Hindus, and Parsees?

When did he say it was wrong to say "Our Father" with separated Christians who were longing and praying for restored unity?

When did Rome condemn any quasi-religious organization of which she has not complete control?

When did the Grand Orient as a result of her action *become* hostile to religion?

Is there anything more in the attitude of Rome towards Freemasonry than a warning against joining any secret society whose ultimate aim is not divulged, and against a particular society which she knows to be hostile?

In the avowed struggle between the Grand Orient and Rome, on which side are Mr Dart and his friends?

Yours faithfully,

Robert Sencourt.

10, Tackley Place,
Oxford.
16 *April* 1951.

The Rev. J. L. C. Dart writes:

If I have misinterpreted in any way the Roman Catholic position with regard to "united worship" I am exceedingly sorry. The only reason why I referred to it was because the Roman ban on Freemasonry had been used as an argument for an Anglican one. I believe that the Roman Catholic attitude towards the whole question of inter-church relations is very different from the Anglican, and therefore its practice is not necessarily an example which we should follow. Mr Sencourt's efforts to promote a better understanding between Rome and Canterbury have been so great, and, if I may say so, so honourable, that the very last thing I should desire would be to find myself involved in a controversy with him. If I have written anything which seems to him discourteous, or unjust, I offer him a sincere apology.

But I suppose I must answer his questions.

(1) Although I was aware that Fr Bonner had stated in *The Tablet* 24 December 1949 "To my mind there would be far less scandal (read theological scandal) if we recited it (the Lord's prayer) with Jews or Mohammedans", I did not, and do not, believe that this opinion is widely held amongst Roman Catholics. But it does seem to me to be evidence that the rule about united prayer with non-Romans applies with equal force to non-Christians.

(2) United prayer with Anglicans was first banned in 1567. Canon 1258 still forbids all "communicatio in sacris". This was held to include the common recital of the Lord's Prayer. "Prayer involves a sacred thing, and the Pater Noster is the most sacred of all prayers, therefore it would seem that a joint Pater Noster, if words have any meaning, must be a 'communicatio in sacris' " (*Clergy Review*, June 1950). This statement, and the whole correspondence on the subject, was written after Rome had relaxed the old rule by the Instruction of 20 December 1949. They testify to the severity with which Canon 1258 had ordinarily been interpreted and to a certain bewilderment caused by its relaxation.

(3) Rotary was condemned by name on 20 December 1950. The decree forbids clerics to be members of the organization or to take part in any of its activities. It warns the laity to beware of it as of all "secret, condemned, seditious and suspect societies". It is true, however, that subsequent explanations to some extent modified the apparent rigour of the original decree.

(4) I am sorry that I cannot give the date for the banning of Continental Freemasonry, except that, I believe, it was one of the consequences of the French Revolution. I know that it was after its ban that the society removed all references to God in its ceremonies, and a body which had been political and revolutionary and anti-monarchical became anti-religious and anti-clerical.

(5) "In its avowed struggle between Rome and the Grand Orient" I and my friends are wholly and unequivocally on the side of Rome.

[This correspondence is now closed.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE CHRISTIAN CHALLENGE TO PHILOSOPHY. By W. H. V. Reade, with a preface by Cyril Bailey. S.P.C.K. 13s. 6d.

The publishers' blurb speaks of this book as a "brilliant work of Christian apologetic". This led one to expect something more systematic and less graceful than what we are given. It ranges widely, touching on a diversity of topics, and opening up more questions than it can manage: and I prefer, as a description, Dr Bailey's words at the end of his preface. He says he has "found the book full of suggestions and of the kind of thought which a layman can readily understand". Therein lies that which will make people glad to read this book. They will read a bit, and then put it down while their thought roams, and then they will come back for more. Perhaps fundamentally this is "brilliant apologetic", but at any rate it is not my way of using those words.

The book was written between 1937 and 1943, when the State did not "tax its members . . . for the provision of free dentistry" (p. 162). But the lag in publication matters not at all. It is still most painfully true that "totalitarianism is most insidious and most deadly when it takes 'democracy' for its name" (p. 165). The author was Tutor in Philosophy at Keble for forty years till he retired in 1937, and Dr Bailey's preface illuminates Reade's "wit and wisdom . . . and his deeply religious nature".

Reade says (p. 120) that "the main object of this book is to define the attitude of the Christian religion towards rival claimants"—that is, to express "the Christian challenge to philosophy—its claim to be reasonable" (p. 116). Reade held that all genuine philosophy is an attempt to answer the question, "Where shall wisdom be found?"; while philosophy, in its current sense, was "a group of highly technical studies, the totality of which has only a verbal identity with the philosophy invented and practised by the Greeks" (p. 139). "Every genuine sect of philosophers has been a 'salvation army'" (p. 18), but the "fatal dilemma" for all Greek philosophers was that "there are no true stories about the Gods" (p. 33). So they had to invent stories, while Christianity didn't. That meant all sorts of things about monotheism, creation, and body; and it also meant that the concept of "reason" must be enlarged. For the perpetual striving "to attain to the universal, to reduce multiplicity to law, and thus to abolish or depreciate the individuality of persons and things . . . is incompatible with the Christian appreciation of truth and life" (p. 152).

I think it would be fair to say that the book is overcrowded. I found myself wondering how soon would come again some such phrase as "The subject is too large for adequate discussion". It comes too many times. But, given this, it is a book which many should taste, and will enjoy; and want to have some more.

H. C. L. HEYWOOD.

SOUTHWELL.

IN THE END, GOD . . . A Study of the Christian Doctrine of the Last Things. By John A. T. Robinson. James Clarke and Co. 6s.

For the last nine years theological debate on the Continent has centred on the question of the mythological element in the New Testament. Rudolf Bultmann (*Neues Testament und Mythologie*, 1941) insisted that the kerygma is embedded in a mythological world view derived from Jewish Apocalyptic and Hellenistic Gnosticism and incompatible with the world view of modern science. If the kerygma is to be made intelligible to modern man it must be restated in non-mythological terms. For Bultmann this means in terms of existentialist philosophy. The mythology of the kerygma is a concrete expression of a particular understanding of human existence released by the event of Jesus Christ.

So far English theologians have made little contribution to the debate. Indeed, Bultmann's essay is only just becoming known in this country, and has not yet been published in English. Dr Robinson's book, however, is indirectly and undesignedly an important contribution to this debate in the limited field of the doctrine of the Last Things.

Working with the conception of revelation as encounter between God and man, familiarized to English readers by such writers as William Temple, Dr Alan Richardson, and others, Dr Robinson formulates a more Biblical and less philosophical conception of myth than Bultmann. Theology uses myth "for the purpose of translating its fundamental understanding of God, given and verified in present experience, into terms of the primal and ultimate . . . the eschatological statements of the Bible are of this 'mythical' nature, in precisely the same way as its narratives of the Creation and Fall. They are neither inerrant prophecies of the future nor pious guesswork. They are necessary transpositions into the key of the hereafter of sure knowledge of God and his relation to men given in the revelatory encounter of present historical event" (pp. 34 f.).

It is the great merit of the book that it never loses sight of this conception of myth and revelation, but carries it through consistently (almost, as we shall see, but not quite) to the very end. All that Dr Robinson has to say about the Biblical conception of time and history, of the end of man and the resurrection of the body, carries conviction precisely because it is controlled by the apprehension of God in Jesus Christ, and is not presented as factual revelation or human speculation about what shall be.

It is in the last chapter (nine, entitled "All in All") that this consistency breaks down. This chapter is a moving, impassioned, and eloquent plea for universalism. Not the ordinary sort of universalism which is based on an optimistic belief in man or ignores the grim eternal choice between heaven and hell. Both myths, Dr Robinson insists, must be held together—the eternal reality of heaven and hell, and the surety that God will be all in all—for both are given paradoxically in the moment of encounter and decision. So far so good, but at one minute to twelve God steps in, omnipotent love triumphs, and all are saved. At the last moment Dr Robinson has

abandoned his fundamental principle. That God will be all in all has ceased to be a myth, has ceased to be truth in the context of encounter, and has become a statement of what shall be. Rather, it would seem both myths must be held together *as myths* right up to the last hour. We cannot take a leap beyond that point and say what shall be. God confronts us in Christ as holy love. What right have we to say that he will drop his holiness at one minute to twelve?

Let us not, however, conclude on this note of criticism. Here is a great little book, which will repay careful study, not only by theological students and parish priests, but by every intelligent listener to the third programme.

Reginald H. Fuller.

St David's College,
Lampeter.

The Theology of Albert Schweitzer. By E. N. Mozley; with an Epilogue by Albert Schweitzer. A. and C. Black. 7s. 6d.

Albert Schweitzer: A Vindication. By George Seaver (A reply to "The Challenge of Schweitzer," by J. Middleton Murry). James Clarke and Co. 6s.

These two books are to be welcomed by all who, attracted by Dr Schweitzer as a personality, desire to find out what he really believes. Readers of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* have often been unable to get hold of *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God, Paul and his Interpreters*, and *The Mysticism of St Paul*. These two books supply much useful information in a small compass. Colonel E. N. Mozley's book will be found the more useful of the two.

The author summarizes in brief outline the essentials of Schweitzer's theology, while the last twenty-eight pages form an epilogue in which Schweitzer states his general position.

Those who are convinced that we have not yet thought our way through all that is involved in the eschatology of the New Testament will read this book with interest, even though they may think (as the reviewer thinks) that Schweitzer has by no means said the last word.

It is likely that the English mind will miss in Schweitzer's Philosophy of Civilization any adequate basis for his theological superstructure; it is not likely that the category of life will by itself give a final basis for metaphysics. Moreover, in the theology which Schweitzer unfolds, the tendency of the German mind to draw sharp distinctions between aspects of truth, until the complementary becomes the antithetical, is likely to make itself felt again and again. Schweitzer seems to leave out evidence or minimize evidence which does not square with the thesis for which he is pleading.

Dr C. H. Dodd has recently reminded us that there are in the New Testament three senses in which Parousia or Advent of the Messiah is understood: (*a*) There is the fact that in the Incarnate Christ the "last days" have already been begun, so that the Kingdom comes with Him and could be said to be "among" those who saw his

mighty works or heard his urgent teaching; (*b*) there is the element of a looking forward to future history, whether that history takes the form of a Coming in Judgment as in the Fall of Jerusalem or the form of a Coming in Mercy at Pentecost; (*c*) the Final Judgment and the passing of time into Eternity.

Schweitzer seems to be so concerned with the third meaning of the word Parousia that he treats inadequately the two other vitally important meanings of that word.

This criticism should not cause anyone to forget the great service he rendered in attacking the Liberal theology of the nineteenth century; moreover, there are many isolated pieces of exegesis, which make the reader feel the brilliance of the mind of the writer; but, when all is said, one cannot feel that Schweitzer has the constructive mind which can provide us with the synthesis in faith and practice we long for.

The second book is a sustained polemic by George Seaver against Mr J. Middleton Murry, whose book *The Challenge of Schweitzer* is criticized chapter by chapter. Sometimes the restraint proper to religious controversy is forgotten—e.g., on page 99 it is suggested that Schweitzer might say to Middleton Murry, "Excuse me now, but I must go round my wards. . . . I could accommodate you quite easily in one of our wards for mental patients"!

One feels that it would have been much better to have some general statement of the central position of both Murry and Schweitzer before being asked to judge this and that point of controversy in its true proportion. Sometimes one wishes to argue with both protagonists; sometimes one has the feeling that Midldeton Murry has more to say for himself on certain points than our author allows—e.g., Murry's view that there is an incompatibility between Schweitzer's pantheistic vitalism and his Christ Mysticism.

As Dr Seaver confesses at the end of the book that he is himself a Platonist, I cannot think that he is radically at one with Schweitzer. The author's own standpoint comes out on page 78, when he says, "Possibly Schweitzer feels that the word Fatherhood has suffered from the theological misusage which postulates a difference in kind between the divine sonship of Christ and other men or which conceives of God anthropologically." Still, the book as a whole is full of interest and covers a large field of current controversy.

The author says on page 119, "It is with relief that I bring this distasteful controversy to a close; it is distasteful in that the challenger is a man of such fine personal intellectual integrity; he regards Schweitzer's religious philosophy as pernicious and an offence to the Christian faith, and I have been obliged to tell him somewhat forcibly that he is mistaken!"

The debate proceeds.

H. K. Archdall.

St David's College,
Lampeter.

LOGIC AND LANGUAGE. A Collection of Philosophical Articles. Edited by A. G. N. Flew. Blackwell. 16s.

It is important to emphasize that this collection of essays, though useful to a student, is by no means the authoritative guide to the essential features of "the philosophy of language" that it claims to be: not even to this philosophy as carried on in England at the present time. To exclude all mention of Logical Positivism and Semanticism on the Continent and in the United States because these types of philosophy make use of formal symbolism and technical terms (*Introduction*, p. 2), while claiming that the book portrays the very same "linguistic movement in philosophy [which] has been taking shape and growing in influence since the beginning of the century", and "which [has] largely transformed the traditional view of the purpose and methods of philosophy" (description on dust-cover)—this is to be quite fantastically barbarous. Three other comparable collections of essays exist all of which give the general reader a better introduction to the philosophy of language than this one. *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, edited by Herbert Feigl and Wilfred Sellars (Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1949), covers the earlier phases of the movement; *Language and Philosophy, Studies in Method*, by Max Black (Cornell, 1949), gets the reader considerably nearer being able to estimate the true scope of the subject, and *The Language of Wisdom and Folly*, edited by Irving J. Lee (New York, 1946), in spite of its title and format, is, for the purposes of a first introduction, the best collection of all.

If the book is taken, however, as a textbook for students which covers a narrow range, then the standard of the contributions, though uneven, is high; and the criticisms which follow are made on the highest level. Waismann's essay on *Verifiability* and Hart's on *The Ascription of Responsibility and Rights* seem to me to embody genuine and illuminating original contributions to thought; Waismann by confronting in detail the ordinary empirical uses of language with the scientific ones, Hart by pressing in detail an analogy of a particular kind between moral and legal statements. John Wisdom's article on *Gods*, on the other hand, though attractive as poetry, is chiefly interesting as an example of the Wisdom technique. This consists, very frequently, in translating a concept into its own more "primitive" equivalent (in this case the concept of "God" to that of "gods") in order to show by examples (*a*) to what extent the "primitive" usage does and does not dominate the whole field of usage, and (*b*) to what extent the analysis given in (*a*) does or does not cause the whole problem to disappear. But in this case the analyst of naïveté has himself become naïf; and, because of this, no contribution to the philosophy of religion has been made at all.

Findlay's treatment of St Augustine's set of puzzles about time is, by comparison with this, adult. He does not, however, explicitly avail himself of Wittgenstein's conception of the many changing notations (grammatico-logical structures) embodied in our ordinary language. Margaret Macdonald, in two essays, examines philosophical analogy in general, and the analogies used in political science in

particular, without attempting either to lay bare the logical structure of analogy in the I. A. Richards manner, or to come to close grips with analogies as used in the sciences. Similarly, Paul Edwards, rightly in my view, treats the problem of the justification of induction as a special case of the results of our craving for unlimited generality, without ever coming to close grips with the logical problems which arise from attempts to limit generality. And Ryle speaks of "logic" without reference to formal logic, of "grammar" without delineating the function of comparative grammar, and of "language" with no hint of "languages". It is as though the whole world spoke standard English; and though the emergence of this type of examination of ordinary language has been made possible only by the fact that ordinary standard English is a quite exceptionally rich and flexible linguistic medium, it remains true that ordinary English is, in some ways, most dangerously opaque, when used for the analysis of itself. Finally, even Paul's outstanding contribution on sense-data does no more than the author himself says it does: "All I have done is to consider a number of questions about the way 'sense-datum' is brought into use, which it seems to me must be considered before anything is said about the larger problems it was introduced to deal with." So, in spite of its strong impact, the book does frequently give an impression of being uneducated. The preface contains a howler; on p. 7, when the author refers to a "misconception that 'Nobody' refers to a person *just as does 'Somebody'*" (italics mine). Also the historical aperçus are inadequate, no mention being made of Mill.

MARGARET MASTERMAN.

CAMBRIDGE.

PSALMS, VOL. 1. By W. Graham Scroggie. Pickering and Inglis. 12s. 6d.

"These volumes are not written for the scholar nor to promote scholarship, but for the general reader, and to quicken devotion." With these words Dr Graham Scroggie introduces the first volume of his studies upon the Psalms, and this deliberate self-limitation of his must be borne in mind by anyone thinking of buying it. It is idle to turn to it for any discussion of the authorship or historical meaning of a Psalm. Dr Scroggie's purpose is to promote personal piety through the study of the words and phrases. If this is remembered, the reader will not be unnecessarily disappointed. To aid this purpose Dr Scroggie prefaces each Psalm with a title which summarizes its lesson, and he adds to his exposition of it a "thought" and a story illustrating somebody's use of it in an hour of need.

Nevertheless, there is an introduction, which explains briefly the character of the Psalms as "lyrical poetry"—"but for the lyre we might never have had lyrics"—and the typical forms of parallelism in their structure, whilst two neat diagrams show at a glance to whom the Biblical title ascribes each Psalm. The author in much of this follows Dr Kirkpatrick, but ascribes the songs of degrees (or

ascents) to Hezekiah, "one for each of the retraced degrees on the sundial of Ahaz". He gives a list of passages in the Psalms referring to the Creation, the Fall, the Flood, Abraham, etc., this proving to his satisfaction their historicity, and, more usefully, a list of prophetic passages which look forward to the coming of the Messiah. The introduction ends with a list of the names of God found in the Psalms, names which, as always with the Jews, describe the character, and with a "reading scheme" for reading the Psalter in a month, which has little to commend it. The Biblical and Prayer Book order seems less haphazard than a scheme which allots to the first day Psalms 1, 31, 61, 91, 121, to the second Psalm 2, 32, 62, 92, 122, etc.

There follow expositions of the first fifty Psalms. The author's titles are often apt—e.g., Psalm 1, "Two portraits"; Psalm 2, "God's King"; Psalm 8, "Man the Viceroy of God"; though some are less happy—e.g., Psalm 22, "The sob and the song". The chief disappointment, however, is the wholly individualistic form of the interpretation. There is no suggestion that these Psalms have been interpreted all down the ages as the utterance of Christ on behalf of his Church or of the Church in union with Christ. Instead of this the author gives short expository sermons, with sometimes illuminating sub-headings, as in Psalm 23, "The Shepherd and the sheep, The Guide and the traveller, The Host and the Guest", and in Psalm 19, "The revelation of God in nature, in scripture and in experience". The rest of the exposition deals with words and their application to personal piety—e.g., Psalm 42, vv. 7–8: "How true this is to experience! First the billows, then the blessings; first the sigh, then the song; first the mourning, then the morning." Each of the Psalms is interpreted didactically in this fashion and this volume will no doubt prove a great blessing to those who like to study the Bible in this way.

J. R. Peacey.

Bristol.

SHORTER NOTICES

Two Religions. By John McKenzie. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.
Religions of the Far East. By George C. Ring, S.J. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. $6.00.

Dr McKenzie's book, which originally formed the Croall Lectures for 1948, is an admirable short exposition of the fundamental differences between Christianity and modern Hinduism. He plainly writes from a lifetime's first-hand knowledge of his subject. Particularly useful are his comments on Mahatma Gandhi's conceptions of caste and of *ahimsa*; he suggests that the first is something short of really adequate and the second something different from the traditional Hindu view. Equally interesting is his remark on p. 56 that what is needed to-day is a Christian *dharma*. Read it if you want a brief and up-to-date book on Hinduism and Christianity.

Fr Ring's book is a handbook of the religions of the Far East.

As such it may be of value to students who do not intend to study any of these religions very deeply. It is plain from the book that the author has not first-hand acquaintance with any of the religions which he describes, nor does he seem to know any of the languages in which the sacred books belonging to the various religions which he describes were written. A foreword, written by the general editor of the series in which the book appears, claims that it is characterized by "minute scholarly research and conscientious thoroughness". If "research" means original research, the claim is not borne out by this volume: the author's sources all seem to be secondary. In the only section of which your reviewer has any personal acquaintance, the Indian one, the claim to "conscientious thoroughness" is not borne out either. It is surprising to find a member of the Jesuit Order writing of "a still more primitive strata" (p. 75); to use the Abbé Dubois as an authority on modern Hinduism is extremely dangerous, as a great deal of his information is out of date by now (p. 193); his transliterations of technical terms are sometimes inconsistent—e.g., we find *sankhara* and *sangharaja* on pp. 206 and 251 respectively, but *samgha* throughout and *samgharaja* on p. 257. In all these four words the *m* and the *n* represent the same letter in the original. It is also surprising that in his account of the Hindu Scriptures he makes no mention of the *Puranas* or of the distinction between *sruti* or revealed Scripture, and *smriti* or remembered Scripture. Also, his statistics of Christians in India given on p. 148 are surely out of date, and one is left wondering after his discussion on p. 188 whether he has really been fair to the *bhakti* cult.

He who wishes to be a really convincing apologist for Christianity against other world religions must possess a certain humility about his own and a readiness to appreciate what is genuine in others. Here Fr Ring seems to fail badly. We are informed in the preface that there is a "gentle humour running through the book like a silver thread"; in fact, it struck at least one reader as a vein of cheap and superficial facetiousness. For example, we are told that in the *Bhagavad Gita* Arjuna wishes to turn away from battle rather than slay his own kin, and our author continues: "But Krishna will not let him emulate the pacifism of Ferdinand the Bull" (p. 184). This insensitiveness is further evinced by a wonderful thickskinnedness about places where his own religion is exposed to very much the same criticism as he levels at others; e.g., on p. 90 he writes apropos of Buddhism of "the comfortable superstition of a vast treasury of merits accumulated by the 'saints'." And on p. 201 he says: "An interval, therefore, of approximately six hundred years separates the lifetime of the prophet (Buddha) from the date when his biography was committed to writing. How splendid a setting these six hundred years afford for the growth of myths and for the obscuration of the true picture of the prophet, it is scarcely necessary to remark." Scarcely indeed, with the example of the Assumption in mind!

ANTHONY HANSON.

DUBLIN.

THE BIBLE FROM WITHIN. By A. G. Hebert. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

This is an important book, and it may well suffer neglect, for it is modestly, though pleasantly, produced as a textbook for sixth forms and training college students. Actually it had its origin in a question put to Fr Hebert by a group of American clergy, "We need help for ourselves, and for our people, in understanding the particular texts we read in the daily lessons in Church. . . . This applies especially to the Old Testament. How are we, and they, to make profitable use of such-and-such a chapter of such-and-such a book?" So here Fr Hebert puts the books of the Bible in their chronological setting, but more than that, and herein lies the importance of the book, in their theological place. There is no shirking of the issues. Though he has to be brief, Fr Hebert manages to give a critical introduction to nearly all the books of the Old Testament and some detailed discussion of the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. It will need some expansion for students and a useful reading list is given at the end of each chapter. Fr Hebert is not afraid to say where his brief answers to critical questions are open to challenge, but without any extravagance he is able to build an integrated picture of God's purpose working out in the history of his people.

Here, and it is tempting to add "at last", is a textbook where the trees are carefully drawn and yet we are enabled to see the shape of the wood as well, where we are helped to see not only what Amos thought about God but what God was doing with Amos, where we can study the one continuous story of God's action with his people, rearing and training, judging and redeeming, begun in Israel and still continuing in the Church to this day. After all, that is what the Biblical authors thought was happening in their work, that God was acting on his people, not that they were producing a progressively more tasteful religious literature. This book will be a good guide to the Bible for lay folk as well as students—yes, and teachers, priests, and theologians, too. It reminds us that true criticism does not reduce the Bible to a series of snippety ideas about God, but enables us to see in it the continuous act of God revealed in very different ways in different books. It is possible to put the pieces together and make something of them all. For all is relevant to God's purpose with his people, all finds its consummation in Christ, and all is relevant to the life of the Church to-day.

J. H. CHURCHILL.

TOTTENHAM.

THE POLISHED SHAFT. By W. E. M. Brown. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

The thesis of this book is that three Evangelical authors, James Hervey, William Cowper, and William Gilpin, though not themselves in the front rank of literary genius, powerfully influenced such giants as Shelley, Peacock, and Jane Austen, both in their purpose and in the material they used. Though the book is pleasingly written, the evidence is neither adequate nor convincing. The book

itself is slight (only 132 pages), and more than half of it is devoted to Hervey, whereas Cowper's early poems, Gilpin, and the final chapter in which the assessment of influence is made, only receive twenty-odd pages each. The final chapter should be much, much longer and far more documented to be satisfactory; in it the author tries to show that, in Shelley's and Peacock's writings especially, the influence of her three writers can be discerned in the later writers' use of literature as a vehicle for preaching, in their insistence on integrity, in their striving after refinement, and their intense seriousness. A writer "with a message" was no novelty, and the references to Addison, Johnson, and Young (pp. vii–viii, p. 81), show there were others from whom the influence may have come; as for the increased seriousness, the Evangelical Revival itself and the French Revolution would in a great measure account for it.

There is little in the Cowper essay that is new, also it is a pity that the author assumes that the details of his life are familiar to her readers; however, she is right to stress the importance of Newton, though it is unfortunate that her book has appeared at the same time as Bernard Martin's *John Newton*, which traces the course of the Newton-Cowper relationship with exquisite delicacy. We are grateful for the introduction to William Gilpin and we should like to know more of the clerical schoolmaster who wrote lives of the Reformers and a book on *The Amusements of Clergymen*.

However, the main value of the book lies in the delightful sketch of the life and literary influence of Hervey. Hervey, though an Oxford friend of the Wesleys, was precluded from an active ministry by ill-health, and sought to influence the upper classes by his writings. In this he failed, but enjoyed a great vogue among humbler folk. Miss Brown has shown that though much of his writing is of poor quality, yet his powers of description were considerable and the complete neglect of his work to-day is undeserved.

MICHAEL HENNELL.

RIDLEY HALL,
CAMBRIDGE.

THE WORD OF TESTIMONY (A Lecture delivered in Westminster Abbey on the Charles Gore Memorial Foundation). By Francis Noel Davey. S.P.C.K. 2s.

It is strange that at this date it should be necessary to say what is said in this lecture, but most necessary it is, and Mr Davey has said it excellently well. He has observed how slight an impact the rediscovered *kerygma* has as yet made, not merely on mid-twentieth-century society, but on the Church which approaches that society. The report, *Moral Crisis*, published by the Church Information Board, which he uses as an illustration of his theme, provides but a typical instance of the frame of mind which is to be found, both in the generality of such reports and in the normal pattern and content of Church utterances, appeals, and interventions of every kind—Jesus Christ is not named. It is to be hoped that Mr Davey's lecture, which incidentally is a masterpiece of cogent brevity, will be widely circu-

lated. It will at once sober triumphant persons who are apt to speak as though all were over but the shouting, invigorate those who seem as yet hardly aware of what the shouting is about, and give pause to those who are shouting about something else. Attended to and boldly undertaken, the unequivocal apostolic policy which it recommends may even now transform us from a hortative into a prophetic Church.

WIGAN. FRANK BENNETT.

THE ROLLS AND REGISTER OF BISHOP OLIVER SUTTON, 1280–1299. Volume II. Institutions to Benefices and Confirmations of Heads of Religious Houses in the Archdeaconry of Northampton. Edited by Rosalind M. T. Hill. Lincoln Record Society. N.p.

This most welcome addition to the Lincoln Record Society's publications reveals Bishop Sutton of Lincoln as a meticulous and able administrator, maintaining an especially firm control over religious houses. The nuns of Catesby had three separate elections of a prioress quashed for technical defects—that of 1285 was "intolerable" and "did not deserve the name of an election"; and when a newly designated Prior of St Andrew's, Northampton, attempted to defend himself against charges of presumption, Sutton sent for the records and confounded him with precedents.

The more routine institutions to livings are calendared briefly in English: there are nearly 400, and they show that practically half those instituted were then not in priest's orders; they seem, however, to have often been local men, sometimes from neighbouring villages. There are a number of interesting incidental entries, such as the kindly provision for a superannuated prior at Daventry, the arrangements for chantries and several domestic chapels, and a brief appearance of the notorious Bogo de Clare. The volume is admirably edited; it has a useful Introduction and thorough indexes. "Piriho" (p. 82) is not Potterspury but Perio in Southwick. "Neubotle" (p. 86) is not Newbottle bridge (in Harrington), but the parish of Newbottle in King's Sutton Hundred.

MAURICE F. BOND.

WINDSOR.

FREEDOM AND CATHOLIC POWER. By Paul Blanshard. Secker and Warburg. 16s.

One hundred and fifty thousand copies of this book are said to have been sold in the U.S.A. at a price equivalent to 25s. a copy, despite the intelligible and resourceful attempts of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to boycott it. It does not make pleasant reading, but all the same it ought to be read. It is concerned with the way in which Roman Catholicism works out when its hierarchy is able to wield social power. Fortunately the problems it raises are not as actual or urgent in England as they are in the U.S.A. Mr Blanshard, who is

remarkably well informed about those aspects of American Catholicism that are relevant to his thesis, does not seem to have any first-hand knowledge of the state of affairs in England. The book is abundantly documented with factual material, and he claims that the Roman Catholics have not been able to refute any of his facts.

Mr Blanshard is honest and fair; he is neither anti-Christian nor anti-Catholic. If he is anti-clerical, who that reflects upon the contents of his dossier will blame him? His standpoint is that of an American liberal democrat. He shows no particular theological insight, and he has only a slight understanding of how the Church of Rome is a *complexio oppositorum*, though it has indeed less of that character in the U.S.A. than in Europe. Mr Blanshard seems to be sufficiently naïve to regard the American principles of the separation of Church and State, and of a secular system of public education, as universal norms or ideals. These limitations in his outlook do not, however, diminish the seriousness with which his indictment and his warnings should be taken.

F. D. Maurice and the Conflicts of Modern Theology. By A. M. Ramsey. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

Although this is a slender volume, it represents a substantial expansion of Prof. Ramsey's Maurice Lectures of 1948, the publication of which has been eagerly awaited by those who heard, and by those who heard of, them. It contains a great deal of illumination for any who are studying Maurice's teaching, and who must often find themselves perplexed by what to make of it and of its relation to other forms of doctrine.

Prof. Ramsey defines his object as being "to trace the theological conflicts which Maurice faced and to relate them to the chief theological tendencies of the last one hundred and fifty years". In the course of this enterprise he touches on most aspects of Maurice's teaching and always with deep discernment; particularly valuable, it seems to me, are the chapters on "Socialism and Eternal Life" and on "The Holy Scriptures". He justly claims that "no previous attempt has been made to evaluate Maurice's teaching on Atonement and Sacrifice as a whole", and the chapter on this subject is certainly useful as far as it goes, but one could have wished for a fuller treatment of it, even if the treatment of other topics that are now comparatively familiar had had to be curtailed.

I have one or two small criticisms or queries. Is it not a mistake (pp. 13 f.) to represent Carlyle and Coleridge as contemporaneously residing in Chelsea and Highgate respectively? The Carlyles went to reside in Chelsea in the year that Coleridge died. It is said on p. 34 that Maurice viewed the Church as the sign that the whole human race was "potentially" in Christ. Maurice, so far as I know, never used the word "potentially" in this connexion, though it is tempting to his interpreters to suppose that this is what he must have meant. There seems to me to be an ambiguity, which should have been noticed, in saying that Maurice was "Anglican to the core"

(p. 113). Some explanation should also have been given of why Maurice regarded "Protestant" as a proper description for a nation, but not for a church (p. 32).

All the same, you will not find in short compass a more reliable, suggestive, and discriminating assessment of Maurice's place and stature as a theologian.

BASIC CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By Paul Ramsey. Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.75.

This is the first book of a young American theologian of whom we may hear a good deal. It is an important book. It is an ambitious attempt to write an introduction to ethics from a consistently Biblical and Christocentric point of view. Anyone who has been charged with teaching Christian ethics knows how hard it is to find satisfactory textbooks. This is hardly likely to prove to be the ideal textbook for English theological students, but it is to be hoped that it will become easily available in England, as it is certainly the kind of book that is needed. Teachers of the subject and the more advanced students will find it extremely suggestive and wholesomely provocative, and will look forward to Prof. Ramsey's future publications.

A. R. V.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

CHRIST CHURCH PUBLICATIONS (ST LEONARDS-ON-SEA): Percy Maryon-Wilson, *The Sound of that Spiritual Trumpet* (1s. 6d.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: J. McLeod Campbell, *New Horizons: Christian Strategy in the Making* (3s. 6d.).

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY PRESS: B. Citron, *New Birth* (21s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: W. E. Sangster, *The Approach to Preaching* (5s.); C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Man* (18s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: W. Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (10s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: I. Allen, *The Early Church and the New Testament* (8s. 6d.); J. V. Langmead Casserly, *Morals and Man in the Social Sciences* (12s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: F. Hilderbrandt, *From Luther to Wesley* (16s.); J. N. Schofield, *Archeology and the After-Life* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: *Guide to the Religious Communities of the Anglican Communion* (5s.); Walter Carey, *Goodbye to My Generation* (10s. 6d.).

O.U.P.: *The Shorter Oxford Bible* (7s. 6d.); H. M. Margoliouth, *William Blake* (5s.); *The Reader's Bible* (India paper, 45s.; Ordinary edition, 30s.).

SCAYNES HILL VICARAGE, SUSSEX: H. S. Box, *The Masonic Death and Resurrection Rite* (1s. 1d. post free).

S.C.M. PRESS: *Intercommunion* (Faith and Order Report) (2s.); R. H. W. Falconer, *Success and Failure of a Radio Mission* (3s. 6d.); *Ways of Worship* (Faith and Order Report) (2s.).

S.P.C.K.: G. C. B. Davies, *The Early Cornish Evangelicals* (16s. 6d.); A. T. Macmillan, *Legal Aspects of Marriage* (1s.).

EMMANUEL VITTE (PARIS): Various authors, *Dialogue sur la Vierge* (270 frs.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher